

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 remain in the application. Claims 1-26 stand rejected. By this Amendment, claim 11 has been cancelled and claims 1, 3, 5, 10, 16, 19 and 25 amended.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 10-12 and 19-26 under 35 USC 102 as anticipated by Lemelson et al. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection.

Generally, the claims describe a system in which stations of a communications network are addressed by location or by status. That is, one might wish to address all subscribers within three miles of a hazardous material spill. As another example, one might wish to address all drivers whose speed exceed 80 mph on highway 101. Neither of the references applied by the Examiner teach such capability. This functionality can be achieved by having a database on board a vehicle which stores status, location and/or history information. The history information might be, for example, a series of location snap shots and the associated time in which a vehicle is at a particular location. That would enable one to identify the fact that it is certain point in time, vehicle was within a certain proximity of, for example, a crime scene.

Turning to the claims, the Lemelson reference does not show "a receiver for receiving a communications request including a query specifying at least one criterion for searching said database... and a transmitter for responding to said communications request

only when said information stored in said database satisfies said at least one criterion" as required by the claim.

Independent claim 10 requires "an input device for specifying a query for searching information stored in said database at one or more called stations, a transmitter for broadcasting a communications request including said query, and a receiver for receiving a response from one or more called stations having information in said database which satisfies said query." This is not shown by the references applied by the Examiner.

Independent claim 16 requires "a receiver connected to said bus for receiving a communications request including a query specifying at least one criterion for searching said database; and... in which said computer is configured for comparing information stored in said database with said at least one criterion, and for responding to said communications request when said information stored in said database satisfies said at least one criterion." This is not shown by the references applied by the Examiner.

Independent claim 19 requires "sending a communications request from an originating station including a query for searching information stored at individual stations; and... receiving a response from only individual stations which have information stored that satisfies said query." This is not shown by either of the references applied by the Examiner.

Independent claim 22 requires "a network channel for sending a communications request including a query specifying at least one criterion from said originating station to all stations and for receiving back a response from those stations at which said information stored in said database satisfies said at least one criterion." This is not shown by any of the references applied by the Examiner.

Independent claims 24 and 25 are computer program product claims which correspond to limitations previously discussed and are allowable for the same reasons.

The Examiner rejected claims 16-18 under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Lemelson et al. in view of Drori et al. The Examiner acknowledges that Lemelson fails to disclose the computer responding to the communications request when said information stored in said database satisfies at least one criterion. The Examiner, however, purports to find the missing feature in the Drori et al. reference. The Drori system, and the portions referred to by the Examiner, utilize a password for access to the system. The Examiner apparently equates this with the "criterion" of the claim. If a password provided matches, then access is permitted. This is really quite different from the functioning of the claimed invention. Even if one were to incorporate the password of Drori into the system of Lemelson, one would not meet the terms of the claims. Further, one would

Serial No. 08/655,133

certainly not achieve the benefits and functionality associated with the claimed invention as set forth in the specification.

For the reasons given, Applicant believes that the application is in condition for allowance and Applicant requests that the Examiner give the application favorable consideration and permit it to issue as a patent.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY



David L. Stewart  
Registration No. 37,578

99 Canal Center Plaza, Suite 300  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
(202) 756-8600 DLS:kap  
Facsimile: 202-756-8699  
Date: August 17, 1998